



EFFECTIVENESS OF VILLAGE FUND MANAGEMENT IN LAIKIT VILLAGE, DIMEMBE DISTRICT, NORTH MINAHASA REGENCY

Samita Wehelmina Abigael Tanod^{a,1*}, Wilson Bogar^{b,2}, Meidy S. S. Kantohe^{c,3}

^{ab}Universitas Negeri Manado, Tondano, Indonesia

¹samitatanod@gmail.com *; ²wilsonbogar@unima.ac.id, ³meidysskantohe@unima.ac.id

Received: 02/04/2026 | Revised: 04/05/2026 | Accepted: 20/05/2026 | Published: 09/06/2026

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of Village Fund management in Laikit Village, Dimembe District, North Minahasa Regency. The research is motivated by audit findings from the North Minahasa Regency Inspectorate for the 2023-2024 period, which revealed administrative and substantive irregularities, including the non-realization of a community empowerment program worth IDR 250 million and the detention of the Village Head by law enforcement authorities in November 2025. This study employs a qualitative approach with a case study method. Data were collected through in-depth interviews with five key informants, field observations, and document analysis. The findings indicate that the effectiveness of Village Fund management in Laikit Village falls into the moderate category. Administrative mechanisms such as Village Deliberations, the installation of transparency media, and the Siskeudes reporting system have been implemented. However, substantive dimensions remain underdeveloped: citizen participation procedural remains and dominated by local elites, transparency is not inclusive due to technical information that is difficult for ordinary residents to understand and unevenly distributed media, and the quality of infrastructure varies without a systematic maintenance mechanism.

Keyword: Village Fund, effectiveness, participation, transparency, accountability

INTRODUCTION

Village financial management at the local level shows significant variation in implementation. In Laikit Village, Dimembe District, North Minahasa Regency, the budget proposal, fund disbursement, and accountability reporting mechanisms followed administrative procedures. However, field evaluations revealed a gap between budget absorption and the substantive impact on community welfare. Inaccurate program targeting, limited community participation in decision-making, and weak horizontal oversight indicate that fund management is not yet fully optimal. This village-level phenomenon reflects the structural challenges of fiscal decentralization in Indonesia, where central fund transfers to villages are often not matched by strengthening institutional capacity and social accountability.[1] Based on this context, the state then guarantees the availability of funds through several sources. The first and largest is the Village Fund from the APBN, which is regulated in Article 72 Paragraph (1) of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages and further elaborated in the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs, PMK, and Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration Number 13 of 2022. The amount is determined based on a formula of population, poverty rate, area, and level of geographical difficulty.

Second, the Village Fund Allocation (ADD) from the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) of the district/city, the amount of which is at least 10% of the regional transfer funds after deducting the Special Allocation Fund (DAK). Allocating funds without ensuring management capacity risks inefficiency and misappropriation. Empirical data from several regions shows that village funds are often fully utilized but lack a sustainable impact. According to Arifin (2020), the effectiveness of fund management is measured by the accuracy of responses to real needs, the transparency of the process, the strength of community participation, and the tangible impact on residents, particularly vulnerable groups. Development in Indonesia since the reform era has indeed sought to move from the top down, from the center to the regions, from cities to villages. However, along the way, villages are often still treated like the youngest child waiting for their share, not as partners invited to think together. Yet, villages are where the majority of Indonesians live, where local wisdom thrives, and where the community's

basic needs are most clearly felt: passable roads, easily accessible clean water, health services that don't force residents to walk for hours, and jobs that don't force young people to migrate from a young age. A major change occurred when the state took a bold step through Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. This law was not merely a technical regulation, but a clear political statement: villages were recognized as legal community units possessing ancestral and traditional rights, and were given the authority to regulate and manage government, development, and community affairs based on their own initiative. Under this law, villages were no longer subordinate to sub-district or district governments, but rather independent entities, with village heads directly elected by residents, with the village consultative body (BPD) as an equal partner, and with the authority to formulate development plans, manage finances, and even regulate spatial planning in their areas (Articles 18–19 of Law No. 6/2014). Most monumental was the recognition of villages' rights to financial resources, including allocations from the state budget (APBN) that were transferred directly to village accounts, bypassing lengthy bureaucratic channels at the district level. This was a form of state recognition that villages were worthy of being trusted to manage state funds for the benefit of their own people (Santosa, 2017). Moreover, this law places community participation as a key principle: every important decision, from budget planning to activity evaluation, must involve village deliberation, not just a unilateral decision by the village head or his officials.

The state then guarantees the availability of funds through several sources. The first and largest is the Village Fund from the APBN, which is regulated in Article 72 Paragraph (1) of the Village Law and further elaborated in the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration Regulation Number 13 of 2022. The amount is determined based on a formula: population, poverty rate, area, and level of geographical difficulty, so that poorer and more remote villages actually receive a larger portion. Second, the Village Fund Allocation (ADD) from the district/city APBD, which is at least 10% of the regional transfer funds after deducting the Special Allocation Fund (DAK), as mandated by Article 73 of the Village Law. Allocating funds without ensuring management capacity can actually open up new opportunities for ineffectiveness, even misuse. Many cases in several regions show that Village Funds are indeed used up, but without a trace. In some cases, funds are used to build roads, but the roads collapse after two rains; funds are allocated for entrepreneurship training, but the participants are only relatives of village officials; funds are planned for women's empowerment, but there is no adequate reporting mechanism, making its impact difficult to track. According to Arifin (2020), the effectiveness of fund management is not measured by how quickly the money is disbursed from the account, but by how precisely the money addresses real needs, how transparent the process is, how strong community participation is in it, and how real the benefits are felt by residents, especially the most vulnerable groups: the elderly, women, people with disabilities, and poor families.

In North Sulawesi, particularly in coastal and mountainous areas like North Minahasa Regency, the challenges of village development are increasingly complex. The hilly terrain, limited transportation access during the rainy season, and economic dependence on traditional agriculture and fisheries sectors make the need for targeted interventions even more pressing. Since 2015, Village Funds have continued to flow to hundreds of villages in the regency. Data from the North Minahasa Regency Community and Village Empowerment Office (DPMD) shows that the average Village Fund allocation per village increased from IDR 492 million in 2015 to more than IDR 680 million in 2023, an increase of more than 38% in eight years. This figure is certainly encouraging, as it demonstrates the government's growing commitment. However, the key question remains: is this budget increase commensurate with improvements in the welfare of village residents? Laikit Village, located in Dimembe District, is one of the villages that received Village Fund allocations within this range. Geographically, Laikit Village is located in the lowlands near the coast, with seven Jagas: Jaga I, Jaga II, Jaga III, Jaga IV, Jaga V, Jaga VI, and Jaga VII. Its total population reaches 1,842 people (BPS Dimembe District, 2023), with their primary livelihoods as corn, papaya, and coconut farmers, and as fishermen—professions that are highly dependent on natural conditions and supporting infrastructure.

The village's economic potential is significant: fertile agricultural land, the development of seaweed and fish cage cultivation, and the presence of farming and fishing groups demonstrate the availability of capital resources that can be developed. However, this potential has not yet been fully realized in the form of equitable prosperity. Since the enactment of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, the central government has affirmed its commitment to strengthening village autonomy through the allocation of Village Funds directly transferred from the APBN to village accounts. This policy stems from the belief that villages best understand the needs of their citizens and are worthy of being trusted to manage public resources for inclusive and equitable development. However, this trust must be balanced with transparent, accountable, and effective governance not only in documents, but in actual practice on the ground. Village financial management includes five main stages: (1) planning through the preparation of the Village Government Work Plan (RKPDes) and the Village Revenue and

Expenditure Budget (APBDes); (2) implementing activities in accordance with the budget implementation document (DPA-Desa); (3) administration through financial recording and reporting using the Village Financial System (Siskeudes); (4) reporting physical and financial realization to the district government; and (5) accountability through the APBDes Implementation Realization Accountability Report (LPJ) which is submitted to the regent/mayor and communicated to the public. Laikit Village, Dimembe District, North Minahasa Regency, is one of the villages that consistently receives Village Funds. In 2023, the village received a budget of Rp720,975,000, and in 2024, this figure increased to Rp727,260,000. This figure reflects the state's growing commitment. However, behind this large allocation, serious findings emerged from the North Minahasa Regency Inspectorate, revealing discrepancies in the management of these funds.

In 2023, an audit revealed several administrative and substantial violations. These included unpaid taxes on the procurement of information technology equipment such as printers, CCTV cameras, monitors, laptops, and sound systems, and a completely unimplemented project to add village Wi-Fi hotspots worth Rp13.2 million. Worse still, a Rp250 million program to procure pig seeds and fertilizer, supposedly part of a community economic empowerment program, was not implemented at all. Total state losses due to this ineffectiveness and irregularities reached Rp269,456,733. The following year, in 2024, similar findings emerged. Village funds were used for activities not in accordance with their intended purpose, such as the distribution of chili seedlings on land without involving beneficiary residents, the distribution of chickens under questionable procedures, and the rehabilitation of village halls and the drilling of wells allegedly not meeting technical specifications. Accumulated losses for that year reached Rp64,461,079. Based on the background description above, this study aims to determine the process of managing Village Funds in Laikit Village, Dimembe District and the determinant factors for the effectiveness of managing these village funds.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach with an instrumental case study design, which was chosen to understand the phenomenon of Village Fund management in depth in its natural context in Laikit Village, Dimembe District, North Minahasa Regency (Miles Huberman and Saldana, 2017). The research location was determined purposively in Laikit Village, which received a significant Village Fund allocation (Rp720,975,000 in 2023 and Rp727,260,000 in 2024) but has a record of serious audit findings from the North Minahasa Regency Inspectorate as well as a case of Elder Law detention in November 2025. The study was conducted for four months from January to April 2026, divided into the preparation stage, field data collection, and data analysis as well as the preparation of the final report. This research focuses on four main aspects of the effectiveness of Village Fund management, namely citizen participation in planning and supervision, the suitability of activity priorities with the real needs of citizens, transparency of processes and information to citizens, and the quality and real impact of development activities.

The primary instrument in this study was the researcher herself (human instrument), who acted as planner, data collector, analyst, interpreter, and reporter of research results, as is customary in qualitative research. Supporting instruments used included a semi-structured interview guide compiled based on the four research focuses, an observation sheet to record the physical condition of infrastructure and the availability of information media, and a voice recorder for interview documentation. The interview guide was flexible, allowing the researcher to develop further questions (probing) according to the dynamics of the answers and situations that emerged in the field. The types of data collected consist of primary data and secondary data, where primary data is obtained directly from in-depth interviews with five key informants and field observations, while secondary data is sourced from official village documents, laws and regulations, and relevant scientific literature.

Results And Discussion

Citizen Participation in Planning and Supervision.

Field findings indicate that the mechanism for proposing village needs in Laikit Village actually has various channels, ranging from Jaga meetings, WhatsApp groups, to direct visits to the village office. FS, a resident of Jaga V, explained that residents' proposals are usually submitted through the WhatsApp group, which is then proposed by the Jaga Head to the village level, while AT from Jaga VII stated that he prefers to propose needs directly to the village office. This difference in methods reflects that not all residents have the same access or comfort with the available formal mechanisms. The Acting Village Secretary, PL, stated that residents' proposals usually come through hamlet meetings, but this statement does not entirely align with the experience of residents who feel the need to take the initiative themselves to have their proposals heard.

The Village Deliberation was attended by community representatives from each Jaga, community leaders, the BPD (Regional Consultative Body), and village officials. However, the participation of ordinary citizens in this forum was still limited. JT firmly stated that those present at the village deliberation were prominent figures in the village, indicating that the discussion space was still dominated by local leaders. FS added that although ordinary citizens could participate, in practice only those with free time actively expressed their opinions. This condition indicates that participation in planning was still procedural, not reaching the level of substantive participation that would allow citizens' voices to truly influence the final decision. Regarding oversight, most informants acknowledged that the role of residents in monitoring Village Fund projects remains minimal. FS stated that residents may rarely monitor the finances, and information is mostly received through verbal notifications from the Head of the Guard or Maweteng. JT even stated that oversight may or may not exist because, in his view, it is not yet very transparent. This finding indicates that the participatory oversight function is not yet functioning optimally, so that horizontal accountability, as emphasized by Bovens (2007), has not been fully realized. Without a mechanism that allows residents to question decisions without fear, budget transparency becomes merely an administrative obligation, not a tool for community empowerment. New Public Service concept developed by Denhardt and Denhardt (2015) emphasizes that the primary duty of public administrators is to serve citizens, not simply meet administrative targets. In the context of Laikit Village, the village government needs to shift from a paradigm of inviting residents to actively involving them. For example, the Village Deliberation (Musdes) time can be adjusted to suit farmers' schedules, materials are presented in easy-to-understand language, and decisions are made through in-depth discussions, not quick votes. Fagotto and Fung (2006) add that meaningful participation does not arise from government benevolence, but from inclusive process design. In Laikit Village, the design of the deliberation process did not fully consider the needs of ordinary citizens, resulting in participation tending to be symbolic and unsustainable.

Alignment of Activity Priorities with the Real Needs of Residents.

Informants agreed that basic infrastructure, particularly roads and clean water, is the most pressing need in Laikit Village. FS and RM mentioned that roads are needed by residents, while AT emphasized the importance of rice assistance because not all residents are farmers; many are elderly, orphans, and widows. However, there is a gap between these needs and the programs implemented. Food security activities are a concrete example. The Acting Village Secretary, PL, explained that in the previous year, the plan to procure papaya seeds was changed to tilapia seeds with the same budget. On the other hand, JT assessed that the rica or chili program was not well-targeted because it produced no results. Changing commodities without in-depth consultation with residents has the potential to reduce the program's relevance, especially if it is not accompanied by technical assistance and market analysis.

The mechanism for determining aid recipients has also come under scrutiny. The Acting Village Secretary, PL, stated that the determination of BLT recipients was based on decile data from the Social Services application and the Head of the Guard's proposal. However, AT argued that direct visits to residents' homes were necessary because some residents were in need but not registered as aid recipients. This finding indicates that administrative data does not fully reflect the reality of poverty on the ground. Frederickson (2005) emphasized that social justice must be a primary consideration in the allocation of public resources. When aid is primarily absorbed by groups already administratively registered, while vulnerable residents are neglected, the principle of justice has not been met. In Laikit Village, reliance on decile data without participatory validation has the potential to reinforce social exclusion, as administrative data often does not capture dynamic vulnerabilities at the household level.

Robbins and Coulter (2018) emphasize three dimensions of effectiveness: conformity to objectives, stakeholder satisfaction, and resource sustainability. In the context of Laikit Village, the conformity to objectives dimension was procedurally achieved because activities were implemented in accordance with the Village Work Plan (RKPDes). However, stakeholder satisfaction was suboptimal because the program did not always address residents' most pressing needs. Arifin (2020) added that the effectiveness of Village Funds is not measured by how quickly funds are absorbed, but by how precisely the program addresses real needs. Changing food security commodities without prior impact evaluation reflects reactive, rather than evidence-based, planning. As a result, although physical outputs are achieved, the expected social impacts are not fully felt by residents, especially the most vulnerable groups.

Transparency of Process and Information to Citizens.

The Laikit Village government stated that budget information was disseminated through transparency billboards and WhatsApp groups. However, there are inconsistencies between this claim and residents' experiences. JT explicitly stated that there is no notice board in Jaga VI to date, while AT admitted not reading the Village Fund notice board, so he still does not know the Village Fund amount. These findings indicate that the formal availability of information does not guarantee substantive accessibility. The World Bank (2019) emphasizes that meaningful

transparency requires not only the availability of information, but also its accessibility, understandability, and usefulness for residents. In Laikit Village, these three requirements have not been met evenly. Regarding ease of understanding, the Acting Village Secretary assessed that the information on the billboards was very clear, but FS and RM acknowledged that some understood it and others did not. The absence of verbal explanations or non-technical summaries made it difficult for ordinary citizens to digest technical-administrative budget data. Mardiasmo (2020) emphasized that financial transparency must be accompanied by substantive accountability, not just neat reports, but decisions that can be accounted for to residents. When residents have to ask a building supply store to verify material prices, this reflects that official channels are not considered a reliable source of information. This shift to informal channels indicates a crisis of trust in the responsiveness of the village government. When needing technical details, residents tend to consult hardware stores rather than through official channels. FS stated that for detailed answers, residents need to attend Village Deliberations, even though Musdes only meet once a year. This indicates that official channels are less responsive to residents' daily information needs. Bovens (2007) emphasized that horizontal accountability can only be realized if there are mechanisms in place that allow residents to question decisions without hindrance. In Laikit Village, the lack of a regular evaluation forum and easily accessible complaint channels prevented the social control function from functioning optimally. As a result, transparency did not transform into an empowerment tool, but remained an administrative obligation.

Quality and Real Impact of Activities.

Infrastructure built through Village Funds in Laikit Village varied in terms of durability and utility. Most informants considered the drilled wells to be functioning well because they were constructed by experts and had a maintenance mechanism. However, roads, the most frequently constructed infrastructure, were reported to deteriorate quickly due to external factors such as heavy vehicles and flooding, as well as a possible lack of material quality standards. AT noted that streetlights deteriorated quickly and were not promptly repaired, while JT added that the educational road had not yet fully met expectations. These findings indicate that planning did not fully consider sustainability and post-construction maintenance. Regarding the alignment of results with expectations, there were differences in perception between village officials and residents. The Acting Village Secretary, PL, stated that no activities had results that did not meet expectations, while residents identified concrete problems such as collapsed roads, poor environmental sanitation, and outages. This difference in perception indicates that the community feedback mechanism is not functioning optimally. Robbins and Coulter (2018) emphasize that stakeholder satisfaction is a key indicator of effectiveness. Without honest and reflective evaluation, program improvements are reactive rather than preventive. As a result, even though activities are implemented as planned, the expected social impacts are not fully realized.

The most tangible changes felt by residents also varied. The Acting Village Secretary, PL, emphasized health programs such as Posyandu (Integrated Health Post) and stunting reduction, RM and FS mentioned road and lighting improvements, while AT stated that she had not experienced anything, only the rice assistance she had received two years earlier. This variation reflects that the benefits of the Village Fund have not been felt equally by all levels of the community. Frederickson (2005) emphasized that social justice must be a primary principle in the distribution of development benefits. When the most tangible changes are felt only by certain groups, while vulnerable residents experience no significant impact, the principle of justice has not been met. This is exacerbated by the absence of a participatory evaluation mechanism that allows residents to provide systematic feedback.

Based on the discussion of the four focuses above, the effectiveness of Village Fund management in Laikit Village is influenced by a complex interaction between supporting and inhibiting factors. On the supporting side, the availability of clear regulations, such as Village Development and Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration Regulation No. 13 of 2022, provides comprehensive technical guidance for village financial management. The commitment of village officials is also evident in their efforts to fulfill administrative obligations, such as the installation of transparency billboards and the implementation of Village Deliberations (Musdes). Furthermore, Laikit Village possesses potential local resources that can be developed through Village Funds, such as social capital through mutual cooperation and farmer or fisherman groups. However, on the inhibiting side, limited human resource capacity is a major challenge. Village officials face difficulties in translating technical regulations into inclusive participatory practices. Formalistic participation mechanisms also pose a barrier, as the Village Consultative Assembly (Musdes) and proposal channels have not been designed to effectively reach ordinary citizens, resulting in symbolic participation. A non-inclusive information system exacerbates the situation, as budget transparency remains technical-administrative without support, making it difficult for ordinary citizens to understand. Lack of evidence-based planning and weak maintenance mechanisms also diminish the value of Village Fund investments.

Field findings revealed that the mechanism for proposing needs in Laikit Village is fragmented: some

residents rely on WhatsApp groups controlled by the Head of the Village's staff, while others take informal channels by visiting the village office directly. The Village Deliberation (Musdes), a forum legally designated as a space for deliberative democracy, is dominated by community leaders, village officials, and elected representatives. Ordinary residents attend physically but tend to be passive, and some even admit to feeling intimidated when expressing their opinions. Horizontal oversight is also not functioning optimally due to residents' reliance on one-sided information from officials and the lack of a structured mechanism for reporting findings. This situation also contradicts Fagotto and Fung's (2006) concept of Meaningful Participation, which stipulates that meaningful participation is measured not by physical presence but by the inclusive design of the process and the citizens' real influence on the final decision. Participation in Laikit Village failed to meet both requirements: the timing and format of the Village Deliberation (Musdes) were not adapted to the work rhythms of farmers/fishermen, the material was presented in technical language, and the final decision remained in the hands of local elites. As a result, participation served only as formal legitimacy, not as an instrument of social control or horizontal accountability. Without a restructuring of the process that opens up space for the voices of vulnerable groups, participation will remain symbolic and unsustainable.

The misalignment between implemented programs and the economic profile of residents, as well as changes in priorities without in-depth consultation, indicate that planning remains reactive and top-down. This weakens the goal attainment dimension, as the resulting outputs do not accurately address the challenges of residents' basic needs, particularly those of vulnerable groups who are not administratively registered. The Laikit Village Government claims to have fulfilled its transparency obligations by installing budget billboards and disseminating information via WhatsApp groups. However, the reality on the ground shows significant disparities: residents in Jaga VI and VII stated they had never seen transparency media, while those who did access the billboards struggled to understand the technical data displayed. The lack of verbal explanations or non-technical summaries prompted residents to resort to informal channels (e.g., asking directly at building supply stores) to verify material prices, indicating low trust in official channels. Based on the World Bank's (2019) open governance framework, meaningful transparency must meet three criteria: accessibility, comprehensibility, and usability. Findings in Laikit Village did not meet these three criteria:

- Accessibility : Information is only concentrated at the center of the village, not evenly distributed throughout Jaga, thus ignoring residents with limited mobility or those living in outlying areas.
- Comprehensibility : The displayed APBDes data is numerical and technical in nature, without contextual narratives or simple infographics. This creates information overload for residents with limited financial literacy, resulting in information being available but incomprehensible.
- Usability : Because data is incomprehensible and access is limited, citizens are unable to use the information to conduct constructive oversight. The transparency function, which should be a tool of empowerment (downward accountability), has instead degenerated into an upward administrative reporting obligation (upward compliance).

Thus, transparency in Laikit Village remains procedural. Without a strategy to simplify information, equalize access points, and hold regular outreach forums, budget transparency will not translate into substantive accountability. Infrastructure built through Village Funds in Laikit Village exhibited marked variations in durability. Borehole wells were reported to be functioning well thanks to the involvement of experts, while village roads and streetlights quickly deteriorated due to heavy vehicle loads, poor drainage, and alleged material inconsistencies. There was also a stark perception gap: village officials assessed all activities as expected, while residents identified infrastructure damage, sanitation issues, and uneven distribution of benefits. Some residents even reported not experiencing significant impacts on their daily lives.

This finding indicates a misalignment with the three dimensions of organizational effectiveness formulated by Robbins and Coulter (2018):

1. Goal Attainment : Quantitatively, the physical targets were achieved (roads paved, lights installed). However, qualitatively, the substantive objectives (improved accessibility, safety, and comfort for residents) were not met due to low construction standards and incompatibility with local geographic conditions.
2. Stakeholder Satisfaction : Citizen satisfaction is low and unequal. The absence of a structured feedback mechanism means that citizen aspirations are not accommodated in program evaluations, while claims of success from village officials are not independently verified. This disparity in perception indicates a broken feedback loop between service providers and beneficiaries.
3. Sustainability : This dimension is the weakest. There is no specific budget allocation for maintenance, no post-construction oversight mechanism for residents, and no plan to transfer management to community groups. Rapidly deteriorating infrastructure without a systematic repair mechanism demonstrates a project-based approach that ignores the life cycle of village assets. Based on the Robbins and Coulter (2018) framework, effectiveness cannot be claimed solely based on budget realization or physical output. Without integrating these three

dimensions, the Village Fund risks producing only short-term, unsustainable development, while eroding public trust in village governance.

Overall, the effectiveness of Village Fund management in Laikit Village remains adequate. Administrative mechanisms are in place, but substantive dimensions such as meaningful participation, inclusive transparency, needs-based planning, and impact sustainability still need to be strengthened. Improving effectiveness requires a holistic approach that not only meets procedural targets but also builds trust, fairness, and the independence of residents as development actors. Thus, the Village Fund serves not only as a budgetary instrument but also as a tool to strengthen responsive, accountable, and equitable village governance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion of the four research focuses, it can be concluded that the effectiveness of Village Fund management in Laikit Village is still in the adequate category, not yet considered effective. Administrative mechanisms are in place, but the substantive dimensions have not yet been fully realized.

Participation: Although proposal channels such as the Village Assembly and Village Consultative Meetings are available, citizen participation remains procedural. This indicates that meaningful participation, as theorized by Fagotto and Fung (2006), has not yet been achieved.

Priority alignment: There is a gap between the program and the actual needs of residents. Despite the importance of food assistance for vulnerable groups, food security activities have undergone commodity changes without in-depth consultation. This finding aligns with Arifin's (2020) critique that the effectiveness of Village Funds is measured by the program's accuracy in addressing real needs, not simply budget absorption.

Transparency: Although the village government claims information is available through billboards and WhatsApp groups, the reality on the ground shows unequal access. The World Bank (2019) emphasized that meaningful transparency requires accessibility, understandability, and usability of information. These three aspects have not been met evenly in Laikit Village.

Infrastructure quality and impact show varying levels of resilience. Differences in perceptions between village officials and residents regarding the quality of activity outcomes indicate that feedback mechanisms are not functioning optimally, resulting in program improvements tending to be reactive rather than preventive (Robbins & Coulter, 2018).

REFERENCES

- Arifin, B. (2022). Community participation and the effectiveness of village fund management in Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta Special Region. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 10(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jakp.78321>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration. (2021). *General Guidelines for Village Fund Management in 2022*. <https://pmd.kemendesa.go.id>
- Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration. (2023). *Evaluation report on the implementation of the Village Fund in 2022*. Village Development Data and Information Center.
- Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration. (2024). *Village financial management statistics 2023*. Village Development Data and Information Center.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Mardiasmo, DA (2020). *Public sector accounting* (4th edition). ANDI Publisher.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia Number 13 of 2022 concerning Village Financial Management. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia* 2022 Number 512.
- Prasetyono, E. (2021). Community participation in village financial management: A case study in Central Java. *Indonesian Journal of Public Administration*, 9(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.24198/japi.v9i1.32451>
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2018). *Management* (14th ed.). Pearson.
- Santosa, MP (2017). *Building villages from the bottom: Village autonomy and social justice*. Student Library.

- Siregar, RM (2021). Dynamics of village deliberation in the context of village autonomy. *Journal of Government Science*, 14(1), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jip.62534>
- Siregar, RM, & Lestari, DP (2021). Dynamics of Village Fund Governance in Coastal Areas: A Study in Sayung District, Demak Regency. *Journal of Coastal and Marine Development*, 17(3), 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jpwpk.17.3.189-204>
- Thoha, M. (2017). *Public administration science: Theoretical and practical studies*. Rajawali Pers.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2004 concerning State Treasury. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia* 2004 Number 5.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia* 2014 Number 7.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 15 of 2004 concerning the Audit of State Financial Management and Accountability. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia* 2004 Number 66.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 17 of 2003 concerning State Finance. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia* 2003 Number 47.
- World Bank. (2019). *Enhancing local government accountability through citizen engagement: Indonesia country report*. World Bank Group. <https://documents.worldbank.org>
- Wulandari, S., & Pratama, A. (2023). Digital transparency and horizontal accountability: Evaluation of the use of Siskeudes in 5 villages in North Minahasa Regency. *Sulawesi Journal of Economics and Public Policy*, 5(1), 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.51854/jekps.v5i1.218>